



To: IMAS Review Board Members

28 April 2004

IMAS REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF REVIEW BOARD MEETING 19 MARCH 2004

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board met in the GICHD Lake Conference Room (3rd Floor) on Friday 19 March 2004 from 09.30 to 15.00 hours.

2. Attendance

The following attended the meeting:

SER	APPOINTMENT	INDIVIDUAL	YES	NO	REMARKS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1	Chairperson (UNMAS)	Noel Mulliner	X		
2	Donor Representative 1	Alistair Craib UK		X	On leave
3	Donor Representative 2	Detlef Schroder Germany	X		
4	Commercial Representative 1	David Hewitson ELS	X		
5	Commercial Representative 2	Gregg Pulley RONCO		X	On duty Iraq
6	National Representative 1	Chan Rotha , CMAA	X		Representing Sam Sotha
7	National Representative 2	Davour Laura, CROMAC	X		
8	NGO Representative 1	Geir Bjorsvik, NPA	X		
9	NGO Representative 2	Vacant		X	Hendrick Ehlers retired
10	ITEP Representative	Tom Bloodworth	X		Representing Dr Alois Sieber
11	UNDP Representative	Mohammad Younus	X		
12	UNOPS Representative	JJ van der Merwe	X		
13	UNICEF Representative	Julien Temple		X	MASG Meeting
14	Specialist Suggestions	Harvard Bach	X		
		Andy Smith	X		
15	Secretary (GICHD)	Phil Bean (Project Manager)	X		

3. Agenda / Discussion Points ¹

3.1 Introduction and Welcome

- The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting and introduced new representatives to the Board. In light of new representatives attending for the first time it was decided to bring item 7 of the agenda forward so that the roles of the Review Board , IMAS Steering Group and Inter Agency Coordinating Group could be discussed and the subsequent work of the meeting to be focused within that framework.

3.2 Roles and TOR, IACG, SG, Review Board.

- The Chairman explained the summary IMAS Management Structure Chart that had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was agreed that one of the current responsibilities of the Steering Group should be redesignated to the IMAS Review Board, that being, 'consideration and approval, as necessary, of minor changes to current IMAS'. **Action UNMAS.**
- The Review Board also discussed whether representatives should be those originally named and elected personnel or whether now, by default, it had to be accepted that groups should be represented by available individuals on the condition that the attendee could answer on behalf of the organisation being represented. In the case of wider groups, like the commercial community, it was decided that the Chair and Secretary should consult users for their opinion and that the Review Board should not expect the individual representatives to answer on behalf of the wider group.

3.3 Minutes of the last meeting.

- The Secretary reviewed the minutes from the Review Board meeting of the 31st January 2003, confirming where actions were completed and where 'on going' actions would be covered within this meeting agenda. A summary progress list of actions from the 2003 meeting is attached at Annex A.
- The minutes were accepted as a true record of the 2003 meeting.

3.4 Secretaries Report to the Review Board.

- **IMAS Framework.** A revised chart illustrating the current IMAS Framework was distributed, and progress of the draft IMAS was discussed. In summary: IMAS 02.10 was still in draft, IMAS 05.10 required some major restructuring. The six series of IMAS relating to training would be covered under a separate agenda item. The mechanical IMAS, 09.50, 09.51 were being reviewed again by their User Focus Group, and would be amended before distribution to the Review Board, (with an anticipated release of mid 2004). The MRE IMAS were awaiting final approval by the IACG. (Afternote: They were endorsed by the IACG on 13 April 2004)
- The Board discussed whether the IMAS for MRE should have been prepared as stand alone IMAS, or subsumed within the overriding IMAS for such topics as accreditation. The consensus was to endorse the IMAS as they were but to

¹ Action organisations are indicated in BOLD.

recognise that some rationalisation and amalgamation of IMAS would be possible in the future.

- Discussion on the format of the framework chart followed and it was agreed that the Secretary should propose a redesign of the chart into a matrix format showing the inter-relationship of individual IMAS. **Action GICHD.**
- **IMAS Amendments.** The Secretary informed the board that he had reviewed all IMAS and that all of them required some amendments, some of these amendments were minor e.g. relating to typing and grammatical mistakes, incorrect referencing to paragraphs or to other IMAS, inconsistent use of language (e.g. misuse of terms for accreditation and licensing, use of the word 'must' instead of 'shall' etc.); however some of the amendments would require major review of an IMAS series e.g. the IMAS 8 series relating to risk management and survey had enough inconsistency to require a major review. The Secretary had a record of all identified amendments available as "highlighted" changes, but explained that the process of going through them would take around six hours, and was not viable at the meeting.
- The board discussed the amendment process, how to record amendments, how to show them on revised issues of IMAS, how to approve them. It was decided that the Chairman and Secretary would ensure full amendment records and would approve minor amendments for inclusion in to IMAS. Any major amendments would be referred to the Review Board and Steering Group, as appropriate, for approval. For accountability purposes future IMAS or amended IMAS would be marked with an issue date and a summary sheet showing amendments from the previous issue. **Action UNMAS / GICHD.**
- **IMAS Application and Outreach.** This was a topic brought forward from the previous meeting with a focus on application of IMAS to national mine action standards. The Secretary explained that GICHD had been developing a series of tools, based on IMAS, to provide support to National Programmes in the design of national standards. An aide memoire of a National Standards framework document had been produced taking the 'what to' descriptions from IMAS into to a 'how to' approach and an outreach programme was being progressed to assist programmes. Outreach will provide a good opportunity to review the operational application of IMAS. GICHD had circulated information to selected programmes for comment and as a product of the 2004 UNMAS Programme Managers Conference had identified programmes to assist and validate the outreach approach. GICHD would keep the Review Board briefed on progress. Additionally Review Board members agreed to support outreach within their routine work and recommended that a workshop should be offered for companies and NGOs on the application of IMAS and the development of operational SOPs. **Action GICHD.**
- **IMAS Critique Points.** The Secretary announced that some general criticism of IMAS continued, that this should be expected as the IMAS process matured, and that specific critique should be sought. He reminded the board of the outcomes of the 2003 IMAS critique questionnaire which were unanimously supportive of IMAS and the support process that was available. Some of the general critiques included: concern over the application of IMAS in that some UN and National authorities did not understand the application of QA processes; that some people still considered the IMAS documents complex and difficult to use; that IMAS for post clearance sampling was not being applied universally and that other example models could be provided; that the mine action community was not

represented in the ownership of the IMAS process,(a reference to new organisations and individuals who were not involved in the original design of IMAS); that IMAS added to cost rather than provided cost and efficiency improvements.

- A study into cost effectiveness / benefits from IMAS was discussed but not considered as practical at this time.
- A discussion followed and recognised that work to assist in mentoring the application of suitable QA processes would be valid and that programmes should be encouraged to be very specific about tasking requirements. David Hewitson articulated the importance of correct threat analysis leading to identification of clearance target size and depth, in turn leading to precise tasking orders and appropriate QA processes. He highlighted the impact on productivity if this was not the case. **Action UNMAS/GICHD**
- Despite the IMAS review process being published on the mine action standards web site no topics for review had been received by the board and a more proactive outreach approach seemed to be required. **Action UNMAS / GICHD to review critique opportunities.**

3.5 Briefing / discussion on future IMAS.

- The Chair led the discussion: At the proceeding UNMAS National Directors / CTA conference the topic of training had been raised. UNMAS will lead a study into the requirements for training within mine action and this may provide better direction for the review and finalisation of the IMAS 6 series. **Action UNMAS.**
- **IMAS 07.20** Contracts IMAS, the latest draft required one more review within the topic focus group before circulation to the Review Board. **Action GICHD.**
- **IMAS 09.50 series**, the Mechanical User Focus group had recently met over the content of the draft IMAS and GICHD was in the process of reviewing the expert opinion and consensus before issuing a draft IMAS for the Review Board to examine. This was not now anticipated until mid 2004. **Action GICHD.**
- **IMAS 8 Series**, the Chairman explained that a revision of the Survey IMAS was needed and that this should address the range of activities under the GMAA inclusive of technical survey and emergency survey etc. **Action GICHD to include this within the 2004 workplan.**
- **Future new IMAS**, the Secretary asked if a new IMAS covering Strategic Planning was required, the advice of the Board was that it was not. The Board discussed and recognised that new IMAS may be required as a result of studies, for example as an output from the GICHD Manual Demining Study and also a result of reviewing IMAS.

3.6 MDD IMAS.

- Following an earlier 'strawman' paper circulated by Andy Smith it was confirmed that a review of all MDD IMAS would be included in the 2004 workplan.

3.7 Application of CEN Workshop Agreements within IMAS

- A CEN Workshop Agreement, CWA 14747:2003 on Metal Detector Testing had been produced, other Workshop Agreements would follow (for mechanical test and evaluation and possibly EOD Competency standards). The process of Workshop Agreements was discussed, it was agreed that CWA 14747 would not be re-written as IMAS but would be referred to as 'Normative References' within the appropriate IMAS documents. Other CWA will be considered for inclusion as an IMAS, TNMA or as a reference on a case by case basis. **Action GICHD.**
- The CEN Process was not well understood by all members, the potential for expanding the opportunities from CEN were introduced by the Secretary and it was recommended that the chair of the CEN WG 126 process, Jan-Ole Roberts of SWEDEC, should be invited to brief UNMAS. **Action UNMAS.**

3.8 Composition of the Review Board, new members.

- Since the inception of IMAS the mine action community had expanded and it was considered useful to expand the Review Board to ensure participation of representative stakeholders. The Board were invited to nominate new members and discussed the merits of nominations by name and / or organisation. By democratic vote, the following recommendations are made to the IMAS SG:
 - International NGO representatives, a number of NGO's were discussed and suggested. Either HI or MAG are recommended to be invited to join the Board.
 - National NGO representatives, either META or ADP should be invited to join.
 - National Representatives from either Ethiopia or Angola should be invited to join.
 - It was felt that a military member would be appropriate to ensure opportunities for sharing of experience, by name Vincent Muylkens the LO with the NATO EOD Working Group was recommended.
 - To ensure participation and communication with CEN it is recommended that Jan-Ole Roberts of SWEDEC be invited to join.
- **Action UNMAS.**

3.9 IMAS Development Funding.

- UNMAS and GICHD had limited funding available for IMAS development and undertook to carryout a budget review of the IMAS Review Board workplan. **Action UNMAS / GICHD.**

3.10 IMAS Review Board Workplan.

- The IMAS review process was discussed and it was agreed that this should be more directed in terms of structuring response from Board members, a revised review timetable would be produced. **Action GICHD.**

3.10 AOB.

- There was more discussion on outreach training, acknowledging the need for specialist application training on certain aspects of mine action, e.g. MRE outreach, MDD.
- It was agreed that the next annual meeting would take place on the Friday following the 2005 UNMAS Conference.

The meeting closed at 15.00hrs.

Phil Bean
Review Board Secretary.

Annex A

Summary of Progress from Actions of 2003 Meeting

- The website should include a section on how to contact the Review Board to suggest amendments to IMAS. **GICHD to action - complete.**
- It was agreed that the focus had moved to the national stage as national authorities continue to develop national standards in accordance with IMAS. The **Review Board** agreed to monitor this development. – **on going.**
- It had been suggested that a Study be conducted on the “Impact of IMAS at the National Level”, including an assessment of the Phase 1 Outreach programme. UNMAS had agreed to develop Terms of Reference for this study if it was required. Response from a survey letter, (that was subsequently sent to all programmes by UNMAS), confirmed that IMAS had been well received and that programmes were content with the available IMAS support. A formal study was not considered justified at that time. **For review.**
- The application of IMAS was discussed, as some board members felt that some people still confuse IMAS with SOPs. **UNMAS** is to investigate the possibility of a training course or pack. **UNMAS** also agreed to discuss this at the forthcoming National Directors / Programme Managers meeting in Geneva in March 2003. – **This was discussed at the 2003 meeting and with a follow on questionnaire which did not identify any training needs, subject held pending future review.**
- There was a discussion as to whether IMAS 09.43 REST should be changed to a TNMA. It was argued that as it was a specific commercial technique it was

inappropriate that it should have the status of a full standard. **Review Board members** agreed to forward their opinions on this to the Secretary after mature reflection – **It was subsequently agreed that REST would remain the subject of an IMAS and that all MDD IMAS would be reviewed in 2004.**

- **GICHD** agreed to obtain a date for the Mechanical Standards from the GICHD Mechanical Study team. **MID 2004.**
- The IMAS Support Pack should be developed as agreed. **GICHD to action – IMAS handbook produced and draft national standards for support produced .**
- It was proposed that an IMAS or TNMA on mine action legislation be examined. It was agreed to wait until the GICHD legislation Study has been published later in 2003. Outstanding. **Carry forward to 2004 .**

Annex B

Summary of Actions 2004 meeting.

- Amend TOR for the SG and RB to reflect amendment authorities, action **UNMAS.**
- Produce new IMAS framework matrix, action **GICHD.**
- Amend IMAS, action **GICHD.**
- Keep RB briefed on outreach progress, action **GICHD.**
- Review mentoring support requirements for threat analysis and subsequent QA processes, action **UNMAS / GICHD.**
- Improve methods for external IMAS critique , action **UNMAS / GICHD.**
- Develop 6 Series IMAS in line with training review, action **UNMAS / GICHD.**
- Prepare IMAS 07.20 for circulation, action **GICHD.**
- Prepare IMAS 09.50/50 for circulation, action **GICHD.**
- Review IMAS 08 Series, action **GICHD.**
- Reference CEN Workshop Agreements within IMAS, action **GICHD.**
- Arrange meeting Jan-Ole Roberts / UNMAS, action **UNMAS.**
- Progress new board member nominations, action **UNMAS.**
- Review IMAS Development budgets, **GICHD.**
- Produce revised IMAS Review workplan, action action **UNMAS/GICHD**